

REMARKS

Claims 1-8, 10-12, 14-18, 23-27, 29, 31-33, 35, 37, 38, 41, 42, 45, and 46 are pending in the current application, with claims 9, 13, 19, 21, 22, 28, 30, 34, 36, 39, 40, 43, and 44 being cancelled by this Amendment. Claims 1-19 and 21-46 currently stand rejected, and claims 1-8, 10, 11, 14-18, 23-27, 29, 31-33, 35, 37, 38, 41, 42, 45, and 46 have been amended. Reconsideration and withdrawal of the claim rejections are respectfully requested in light of the preceding amendments and following remarks.

Examiner Interview

Although the Examiner indicates in the June 25 Advisory Action that no agreement was reached with regard to the claims in the May 4 interview, Applicants understand from the interview that the Examiner, in view of FIG. 24C of Yamauchi, with its logic in steps S168 and S151, interprets the block pointers in Yamauchi's PGC link information as the "flag" recited in the claims. Applicants have amended each independent claim based on this understanding of Yamauchi as explained during the interview.

Claim Rejections – 35 U.S.C. § 103

Claims 1-4, 9-19, and 21-46 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over US Pat Pub 2002/0106196 to Yamauchi et al. ("Yamauchi") in view of US Pat Pub 2001/0043790 to Saeki et al. ("Saeki"). Applicants traverse these rejections for the reasons detailed below.

With regard to claim 1, Applicants note that the claim has been further amended to recite the “entry point **map including a plurality of flags**, each flag being associated with one of the plurality of entry points and indentifying whether jumping to another clip file is permitted in relation to the one entry point,” which is different than the subject matter of claims 1, 11, or 13 previously argued during the Examiner interview and in previous Applicant responses. The Examiner alleges that Yamauchi teaches the recited flags with block pointers in its PGC information, processed according to FIG. 24C. Even if the block pointer were to be reasonably interpreted as the recited “flag” (which Applicants argue below that it is not), Yamauchi discloses only a **single block pointer** is ever used or present. See Yamauchi, ¶¶ [0272], [0274] (“the block pointer”). Yamauchi is silent with regard to a plurality of block pointers, and it is not clear how or why more than one block pointer would ever be present in Yamauchi.

Applicants further submit that the block pointers in the PGC information of Yamauchi are not a “**flag**” in an entry point map **stored on a computer readable medium**. Yamauchi nowhere indicates that the block pointer is stored or read from a computer readable medium; rather, it appears that the block pointer is formed in the reproduction device, based on the reproduction device changing the value of the block pointer. See Yamauchi, ¶ [0276]; FIG. 15 (PGC Information not shown containing block pointer). Moreover, the block pointer is a number that merely indicates which block of a VOB is currently being reproduced. See Yamauchi, FIG. 15, 24C, element S168; ¶ [0276]. The

block pointer value alone does not indicate jumping functionality, like a flag does, because the block pointer value must be compared to the final logical block number in the VOB in order to determine jumping functionality. Thus, Yamauchi is further lacking a flag stored on a computer readable medium.

Applicants further submit that the block pointers **do not indicate whether jumping is permitted**, because jumping will always occur in Yamauchi, even when the final logical block is reached. See Yamacuhi, ¶ [0282] (describing jumping outside the block to a different branch is done once the final VOB is reached); FIG. 24C, elements S157-S159. Rather, the block pointers merely indicate **how/where** the inevitable jump is to occur. See Yamauchi, ¶¶ [0276]-[0277]; FIG. 24C, element S165. It is not reasonable to interpret permission to perform a jump as instructions for doing so. Thus, Yamauchi does not teach the flags indicating jump permission as recited in claim 1, which Yamauchi is alone applied for teaching.

With regard to claim 11, Yamauchi does not disclose “each data unit in a same clip file has a **same number of entry points**” as recited, by Yamauchi’s disclosure of VTS internal search pointers, which are a type of PGC link information. Yamauchi nowhere indicates that these search pointers are “entry points” – indeed they appear to be mere **identifiers** of title and title set number. See Yamauchi, ¶ [0188]. Further, Yamauchi indicates that the VTS internal search pointers are user-set, such that different titles may have **different numbers of search pointers, depending on user discretion**. See

Yamauchi, ¶ [0188]. Thus, Yamauchi does not teach the equal entry points among data units as recited in claim 11, which Yamauchi is alone applied for teaching.

Saeki, which is not applied for the entry points or jump flags discussed above, does not cure the differences between Yamauchi and claims 1 and 11 discussed above. Because Yamauchi, alone or in combination with Saeki, fails to teach or suggest each and every element of claims 1 and 11, these references do not anticipate or render obvious claims 1 or 11. Claims 23-26 are equally allowable over Saeki and Yamauchi because they recite the unique features of claims 1 and/or 11 discussed above. Claims 2-8, 10-12, 14-18, 27, 29, 31-33, 35, 37, 38, 41, 42, 45, and 46 are allowable at least for depending from an allowable base claim. Withdrawal of the rejection under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) to claims 1-8, 10-12, 14-18, 23-27, 29, 31-33, 35, 37, 38, 41, 42, 45, and 46 is respectfully requested.


CONCLUSION

For the above stated reasons, reconsideration and withdrawal of the pending rejections and favorable allowance of all claims 1-8, 10-12, 14-18, 23-27, 29, 31-33, 35, 37, 38, 41, 42, 45, and 46 in the instant application are earnestly solicited. In the event that any matters remain at issue in the application, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned.

Pursuant to 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.17 and 1.136(a), Applicant(s) hereby petition(s) for a two (2) month extension of time for filing a reply to the outstanding Office Action and submit the required \$490.00 extension fee herewith.

If necessary, the Commissioner is hereby authorized in this, concurrent, and future replies, to charge payment or credit any overpayment to Deposit Account No. 08-0750 for any additional fees required under 37 C.F.R. §§ 1.16 or 1.17; particularly, extension of time fees.

Respectfully submitted,
HARNESS, DICKEY & PIERCE, P.L.C.

By 
Gary D. Yacura, Reg. No. 35,416
Ryan Alley, Reg. No. 60,977
P.O. Box 8910
Reston, Virginia 20195
(703) 668-8000

GDY/REA: tlt